The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

Vol. II.—No. 9. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1861. WHOLE NUMBER 61.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at [illegible], [illegible] Harper's Buildings, New-York.

William Goodell, Editor. [illegible]

Terms: [illegible]

[illegible]

PROSPECTUS.

[illegible]

[illegible]

THE BIBLE ABOLITIONIST:

[illegible]

[illegible] given by [illegible] God, and is profitable for doctrine, for [illegible] That the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.—[illegible]

Part III.—Slaveholding brought directly to the test of the Bible.

CHAPTER II.

IS SLAVEHOLDING SINFUL?

We come now to our second inquiry. Having proved that the Slave *System* is sinful, we inquire whether it be not sinful to *hold* slaves under that system?

To do so, is, evidently to give practical support to the sinful system. And how can this be otherwise than sinful? What right can any man have to support that which is wrong? Or how can he innocently do so? What *other* wicked system can any man support, by lending to it the influence of his example, and yet remain innocent?

Take the system of idolatry, for instance. Could Naaman bow down before the idol in the house of Rimmon, while his master, the king of Assyria, leaned on his arm to worship there, and remain innocent? When he said "The Lord pardon thy servant in this thing," did he not betray the fact that his own conscience told him that the act [illegible] pardon? (II Kings, v. 18.) Could his mental reservation, coupled with his disclaimer of idolatry, in the absence of his monarch, render the deed innocent? Why then, did it need pardon?

But the slaveholder does something more than merely to give [illegible] and support to the Slave System, with all the other slaveholders in the land leaning on his arm for support. He becomes, in person, one of the wrong doers himself. You admit that the Slave System is sinful. But why and wherein is it sinful? Primarily and chiefly because it [illegible] the very [illegible] which every slaveholder [illegible]? Examine in detail, and see.

The Slave system is sinful, because among other things, it [illegible] the holding of human beings as chattels. But the system would not be sinful in that feature of it, if the practice of holding human beings as chattels were innocent. And every slaveholder does hold a human being as a chattel, that being the only manner by which an American Slave [illegible].

The Slave system is also sinful, because it [illegible] or permits the [illegible] of labor without wages. The system would not, at this point, be sinful if it did not permit or authorize this act, nor, if the practice were authorized, [illegible]. But no slaveholder pays his slave wages, nor can he do so, while he holds him as a slave.

The Slave system is also sinful, because it denies the moral freedom of the slave—his right to obey God rather than man. But every slaveholder, [illegible] the slave's moral freedom, or his right to obey God rather than man. When he does this, he [illegible] the law.

The Slave system is also sinful, because it [illegible]. And no slaveholder, [illegible] has already been shown, can [illegible] marriage as the [illegible]. When he has effectually [illegible] their right to marry, [illegible] their right to freedom.

Another [illegible] feature of the Slave system is its authorizing the sale of human beings and the separation of fathers and mothers and their children. Though every slaveholder does not actually sell or buy human beings, and separate fathers and mothers and their children, yet he wickedly *claims the right* of doing so, in the very act of claiming and holding them as chattels. For the right of ownership of chattels includes, (as Henry Clay testified)* the right to sell them at pleasure or for the owner's advantage. And every slaveholder wickedly holds his slave subject to be seized and sold for debt, or conveyed, on his decease, to his heirs at law.

In the preceding particulars it is evidently futile for those who admit that the Slave system is sinful, to plead for the innocency of slaveholding. The system is sinful, because it authorizes and sanctions these acts which are all included in *slaveholding*.

The Slave system does indeed authorize atrocities which every slaveholder does not commit. But every slaveholder allows himself to stand in a position tempting him to commit those atrocities, or in a position liable to such temptations, being beyond the control of restraining law. The spirit of the prayer, 'Lead us not into temptation,' forbids any man to hold irresponsible power over his brother. The spirit of the precept 'Be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation,' forbids slaveholding. (James iii. 1.) And so does the precept of the Saviour—"Be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ."—Math. xxiii. 8. If this does not preclude slaveholding, what claims of authority of man over man, can it preclude? Not that of the Papacy, most assuredly, for the authority of the slaveholder, whoever he may be, includes all the authority of the Pope and much more, for the Pope never claims his subjects as chattels personal, nor treats them as such. If the Pope, for claiming [illegible] authority, be "the Man of sin, exalting himself above all that is called God and is worshipped"—shall we say less of the slaveholder? If the [illegible] slaveholder may be justified in his slaveholding, because he does not abuse his power to the utmost, why [illegible] for the [illegible] Pope?

GOOD TREATMENT.

"Good treatment" of slaves cannot justify the slaveholder in his slaveholding, any more than a robber's refraining from murder, or from barbarity, or his [illegible] kindness to his victims can justify his robbing them. The [illegible] of all [illegible] a [illegible].

More than this. The human being is not well treated who is held as a chattel [illegible] an [illegible] would be well treated, if [illegible]. The [illegible], the degradation is the primary wrong, and it renders the greatest wrong, whatever may be the other wrongs added to it. In the light of the Bible, whoever man is regarded as the image of his Maker, a "little lower than the angels," all this must be plain to be argued. The Bible idea of man [illegible] to [illegible] for the idea of a well treated slave, or the innocent slaveholding. [illegible] the matter [illegible] whether the idea of a well treated slave [illegible] of absurdities and [illegible]?

A man, [illegible] is [illegible] well treated? He is forbidden [illegible] his Bible [illegible] Supreme [illegible] he is well treated? He is forbidden [illegible] felicity, but he is well treated! He is [illegible] against [illegible] well treated! He is not permitted to [illegible] with it, [illegible] he is well treated! Though [illegible] to be judged according to the [illegible] he is not permitted to [illegible] his own [illegible] to [illegible] his rule of life, nor [illegible] to [illegible] but he is well treated! He is not permitted to [illegible] of religion, the rights of conscience are not recognized, but he is well treated! He is denied the protection of law, and debarred, on penalty of death, from any act of self defence, but he is well treated! The female slave may not [illegible] violation, but she is well treated! The slave may not change his residence, "in pursuit of happiness," or to discharge what he believes to be his duty, except on pain of death, without judge or jury, but he is well treated! He is outlawed, if he seeks freedom, and if, to sustain life in doing so, he takes a tythe *of* a tythe of his own earnings, but he is well treated! He is confined to the one spot of earth his master designates, or he must go wherever his master sells him, but he is well treated! He is compelled, in a professed Christian land, to be a heathen, but he is well treated, especially if he is CONTENTED in his heathenism! He is *subject* to all this, if it be not all in detail inflicted on him, and he has no remedy, but he is well treated! It is, for the most part, his inevitable destiny, whoever may be his master, and he is daily liable to be sold to the worst, or to have his wife and children sold, but he is well treated!

It is easy to understand that some slaves are worse treated than others, and that some slaveholders add to the guilt of their slaveholding, the guilt of [illegible] cruelty, barbarity, [illegible] at their slaveholding [illegible] and tempts them to do. But it is difficult, nay, impossible to see how the holding of a slave as a slave can [illegible] treatment [illegible] that the slave is not a man, or else that a man is well treated when treated as a [illegible]. No man ever thinks *himself* well treated in being held as a slave, or that his own child [illegible] treated in being [illegible]. Neither [illegible] in [illegible] than of enslaving and holding him as a slave.

The real truth is, no man can believe in the innocency of slaveholding, or that the slave can be well treated in being thus held, who believes that the slave is a man, in the Bible acceptation of that term—the offspring of God, the child of [illegible], the purchase of Christ's blood, [illegible] Holy Ghost, [illegible]. It is only from the [illegible] that any [illegible] of the slavery question can be taken. If men, or, as some [illegible] of God think, the brute, if he be not too inhumanly [illegible], if he be [illegible] a [illegible] animal. If the higher dignity [illegible] and [illegible], and the Salvation of Christ [illegible], and the [illegible] —as if the slave, [illegible] his dignity, his [illegible], the [illegible] of [illegible] then, [illegible] for the idea that he may be well treated in being held as a chattel, provided he be not under-fed, nor over-worked, nor needlessly lacerated nor scourged. And this is the commonly received idea of the good treatment of slaves and of innocent slaveholding!

*Speaking of the [illegible] United States [illegible] the rights of property [illegible] "property," and that the right to hold includes the right to sell.

My slaves are fat and sleek [illegible] all that an [illegible] need say, to justify his slaveholding [illegible] many who are called Christians

The [illegible] up by some [illegible] holding their slaves as Christian [illegible] and then [illegible] ruling [illegible] as Romish [illegible] lords over God's heritage, the claim of holding the members of Christ's body as "goods and chattels personal" of holding immortal souls under the same property tenure with horses and swine—this is a climax of [illegible] absurdity and impiety that throws over the openly [illegible] slaveholder, the mantle of comparative decency and consistency. Yet this is the precise description of [illegible] slaveholding, so frequently and confidently presented for our approbation.

The idea of innocent slaveholding draws deeper than some of its religious advocates have considered. They would shrink from denying either the immortal nature of man or the manhood of the slave, or of the colored race. They would equally recoil, perhaps, or some of them would, from the idea of holding the heirs of immortality as chattels personal. But in one or the other of these impieties are they inevitably involved the moment they contend for innocent slaveholding. To say that negro slaves have no souls, or that souls may be held as chattels personal are, alike, gross insults to the God of the Bible.

They are little aware, perhaps, of the virtual identity of the idea of innocent slaveholding, with the ultra and novel pro-slavery claim that *the right to* hold a slave, like the right to hold all other property, is a natural right "before and higher than any constitutional sanction."* Religious editors have strongly condemned that idea, who have nevertheless defended the idea of innocent slaveholding. In the light of the Bible, however, it is easy to see that the two ideas, if they may be called two, are inseparably connected together. The Bible teaches that whatever we do must be done to the glory of God, (1. Cor. x. 31.) that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." (Rom. xiv 23) that the Divine law must control all our actions, that none of our actions are indifferent, that whatever is not righteous is unrighteous, that he that gathereth not with the Great Master above, "scattereth abroad" (Math. xii. 30.) Slaveholding, therefore must be either righteous or unrighteous, and "all unrighteousness is sin." (1st John v., 17.) Slaveholding, if innocent, is not sinful. If it be not sinful, it is righteous. If it be righteous, it must be in accordance with the moral law, the law of God, which is the law of nature. In other words, it is, (as its consistent advocates claim) a natural right. And if so, it is "before and higher than any constitutional sanction," of course. Innocent slaveholding must be in accordance with natural law, which no human constitutions or statutes can annul.

Thus does the doctrine that slaveholding is not sinful, or, that it is, or may be, innocent, identify itself with the highest and most startling claims that the advocates of perpetual and universal slavery have ever adduced, or of which it is possible to conceive. If slaveholding be not sinful, then all enactments abolishing slavery and the slave trade are violations of natural right, and are themselves sinful.

*[illegible] Constitution for Kansas.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNITY.

No. 2

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

Slavery has blinded the eyes of the Nation, and made our wise men grope, in darkness. Self-evident fundamental principles, which are as guiding lights on the subject of Government, and illuminate the path of the upright statesman, are practically repudiated. The dogmas of despotism usurp their place, and govern the action of legislatures and courts. Wrong is put for right, and right for wrong. [illegible] ed, requires the support of misstatement and [illegible] reasoning. The President [illegible] the threatened secession of [illegible] the States [illegible] to "the incessant and violent agitation of the slavery question throughout the North, for the last [illegible] of a century." This agitation, he [illegible] "has at length produced its malign influence on the slaves, and [illegible] with [illegible] of freedom. Hence a sense of [illegible] exists around the family altar." What [illegible] hy. To expostulate with [illegible] slavery, produces bad effects on the [illegible] with regard to his wrongs; but the slave should get some [illegible] notions" about his own rights, and thus many a matron throughout the South should retire at night in dread of what may befall herself and her children before the morning. Such dread we are [illegible] from abolition meddling.

With more correct views of our national disease, and a willingness to promote its only possible cure, the President might have shown the utter hostility of slavery to all the ends of Government, and all the interests of the Union. He might have told us that its antagonism to other interests necessarily engenders dissatisfaction and alienation, and thus tends to secession. Sustaining himself by Southern authorities, he might have said, the training of slavery makes men restless, despotic, and lawless, and utterly unfits them to endure constitutional restraint. He might have argued that, but for slavery, the Union would be strong by its own natural adhesion: that the insecurity of the South results not from northern discussion of slavery but from the Southern *fact* of slavery: that the "family altar" would be safe, if all the people were duly protected in their family rights: and that "many a matron" will cease to retire at night in dread of what may befall herself and her children, when the slave mother shall cease every day to dread what may befall *herself* and *her* children from the slave auction. He might have referred to the happy security which emancipation brought to the British West India Islands. It would have been quite in the President's way, if he had chosen it, to disabuse the national mind with regard to St Domingo by showing that the bloody scenes of that island were not the result of emancipation, but of an attempt to re-enslave the emancipated, after the island had enjoyed several years of remarkable tranquility as the fruit of emancipation. Finally, the President, instead of proposing amendments of the Constitution in order to make its recognition of slavery "express," should have urged a fulfillment in good faith of its "express" provisions of liberty, to all the people of the land.

The idea that slaveholders fear an insurrection of their slaves from Northern agitation, is very absurd. They have sense enough to know that slaves cannot be affected by Northern publication which they cannot read. The fears of slaveholders are the fears of conscious wrong. Mr. Calhoun, alluding, in the United States Senate, to some opinions of Southern senators, said.

"Do they expect the abolitionists will resort to arms, and commence a crusade to liberate our slaves by force? Is this what they mean, when they speak of the attempt to abolish slavery? If so, let me tell our friends of the South who differ from us, that the war which the abolitionists wage against us, is of a very different character, and far more effective—it is waged not against our lives, but our character."

Let the agitation be about some *lawful* ownership, and slaveholders will not feel their character touched. Duff Green, a champion of slavery and editor of the *United States Telegraph*, expressed himself thus

"We are of those who believe that the South has nothing to fear from a servile war. We do not believe that the abolitionists *intend*, nor could they if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection. The danger of this is remote. We believe that we have most to fear from the organized action upon the consciences and fears of slaveholders themselves; from the insinuation of their dangerous heresies, into our schools, our pulpits, and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the week and feeble, and diffusing among our people a morbid sensibility on the question of slavery, that the abolitionists can accomplish their object [illegible] s.

MET ON THEIR OWN GROUND

To those who are fond of representing the Federal Constitution as being contrary to its own express language, its known history, and its uniform construction by the Federal Courts and by all administrations, *not* an institution of a National Government by the *people*, but a mere compact or Treaty of absolutely sovereign *States*, retaining all their sovereignty we commend the following editorial of the N. Y Sun

THE UNION AS A CONTRACT.

The Union, according to the philosophers of secession, is a violated and therefore a [illegible] contract, null and void, because it has not been wholly kept. If acts of infidelity in particular respects can abrogate a contract, then the ultra slave-states have certainly made away with the Constitution long since. They have trampled its sacred and tatters. But this is not [illegible] what they mean. It is the *northern* infraction of the compact which, says the [illegible] virtue of [illegible] perfidy and total [illegible] legal and honest on the opposite part.

The "constitutional lawyers" of the southern [illegible] admit that they as states entered into a contract with [illegible] other states, called the Constitution of the United States. But they maintain that [illegible] of the parties having violated certain items of the said contract, in [illegible] instances, they are thereby released from all the obligations, and from the claims of all the parties thereto. According to this principle, [illegible] it is only necessary for one of the stockholders in a railroad company to commit some breach of its charter, in order to explode the whole corporation into individual atoms, and abrogate the entire liability of the concern.

But stripped of all the extreme aggravations of the case as it stands, the principle asserted is equally unknown to law and honesty, in any shape. Messrs Yancey, Benjamin, Soule, and others who are dinning this disgraceful argument into the ears of the civilized world, are lawyers and as lawyers, *they know better*. Not one of them would dare to argue, on such grounds, the invalidation of a partnership between a wood-sawyer and his clerk, before a justice's court. They know perfectly well, that a violated agreement subjects the violater to damages, to the amount of the wrong done, and no farther. It does not deprive him of all rights whatever, to have committed some wrong. If a client were to submit to one of them, professionally, the case of a contract partially fulfilled, and partially broken, would he be advised that he might safely disregard that contract, as null and void? Not at all. They would tell him that he was entitled to *remedy*, not *release*; that the law would grant him no vindictive damages against his antagonist, nor any profitable privilege of revolt from the engagements he had entered into. None of these gentlemen could have read in a lawyer's office the first six months, without learning that a contract cannot be killed by a mere wound or partial breach, but must be violated entirely, in its whole spirit and substance, and that by *all* the parties save those taking advantage of the breach.

Contracts often provide a mode for determining disagreements and damages arising out of the conduct of the parties. And if they do not, the law does. It is thus with the constitution of the United States. Every wrong and offence finds its legal remedy under the Constitution, *except that of refusing to abide by that legal remedy*. This alone is that *total* violation of the compact which, if persisted in, necessarily explodes it, and releases from all obligation toward the offending party. And it is a singular fact that South Carolina is the only State which has been guilty of this. South Carolina alone has deliberately persisted in preventing by force any appeal to the constitutional tribunals, against her own unconstitutional acts. If other States have passed unconstitutional acts, the way has always been open and unobstructed fur their review and condemnation, and the Supreme Court has always been satisfactory in its decisions to the South. South Carolina alone, refuses to submit her laws to the arbitrament of the Supreme Court, thus violently absolving herself from the very last essential of the compact, and then turns around with matchless effrontery, to absolve herself over again, in a moral sense, by the plea that other states have enacted unconstitutional laws! Enough said.

REMARKS. Thus reasons the *N. Y Sun*, and who is able to answer it? The doctrine might be carried still further, or applied in a different direction. *States are bound by their compacts and treaties, as truly as by their Constitutions.* This doctrine, being made clear as the sun, by "THE SUN," we assume as our premises, and proceed to draw our conclusions. The "compact" or "treaty" (if it be such) says—"No State shall pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligations of contracts." And further—"The United States *shall* guaranty, to every State in this Union, a Republican form of Government." And yet again, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," &c &c "shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby anything in the Constitution and laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," so that the "compact" or "treaty," forbids the States to maintain slavery, and [illegible] the United States to abolish it!

WHAT IT IS THAT DISTURBS THEM.

In a recent speech in the Senate on the Kansas [illegible] Mr. NICHOLSON of Tennessee said—

The Republicans concede that in the *States*, the South have a right to hold slave property, but establish a principle, in places where they have the power, which affixes a stigma on Southern men. All that the South have to rest upon is the profession of a party whose general principle is to disregard the rights of the South [illegible] State. Suppose that this party gets a majority in both Houses of Congress they will abolish slavery in [illegible]

[illegible] new Slave States. [illegible] should begin to look out for their own interests, when, if the national [illegible] will surely progress toward the extinction of Slavery. [illegible] that the Fugitive Slave [illegible] of the Senate [illegible] a principle [illegible] down that denies the title of Southern men to property which they claim under the Constitutional principle which strikes at the very root of a [illegible] with the [illegible] prosperity and [illegible] of the South. Mr. Nicholson argued that Mr. Lincoln [illegible] Slavery and [illegible] that the Constitution [illegible] such a way that an [illegible] could be made to the final extinction of Slavery. Is it strange, then, that the people of the South are alarmed at the election of a candidate for the Presidency holding such views? *The trouble is that the North has conceived a prejudice on the principle that Slavery is sinful, and ought not to exist.* Mr. Nicholson [illegible] that nothing but full constitutional guarantees would save the Union. No State was more attached to the Union than the State he represented in part, yet the sentiment was widely spread there that the result of the late election would render the preservation of a constitutional Union impossible. Unless proper guarantees are given, he thought that a majority of the people of Tennessee would be impelled to separate from the Union. He (Nicholson) would do all he could to obtain proper guarantees, but if all failed he would [illegible] secession or revolution rather than acquiescence. He regretted hasty action in the South, and he thought it better to have counsel and concerted action in the Senate. He thought that an appeal from the whole South, with unanimity of sentiment, would not be resisted by the North. He regarded the policy of the extreme Southern States as dictated by a desire to awaken the sentiment of the North rather than a love of disunion per se. He thought that it was the duty of the border States to meet in solemn consultation and present their demands to the North. But from the course of the Republican organs he had scarcely a ray of hope that their demands would be granted. The chief points in our demand would be *the recognition of the right of property in slaves*, and the right to hold them in the Territories. Although he had not much hope left, yet he preferred to try if a solemn appeal from the South to the North would not produce a good effect. Mr. Nicholson then referred to the ordinance of secession of South Carolina as the act of a sovereign State, saying that he should only allude to it as a fact, not argue whether it was right or wrong. He argued that any resort to force by the Federal Government was equivalent to a declaration of war by South Carolina. She had absolved her citizens from all allegiance to the United States, and the Government could not make war rightfully upon them. He drew a picture of the horrors of civil war, and urged calmness and consultation on the part of the Southern States. He concluded by expressing the hope of a more perfect Union at no distant day.

The *trouble*, then, is, that slavery is considered *sinful* and that slaves are not conceded to be *property*. Only regard slavery innocent, and slaves property, and there would be no disturbance, very reasonable conditions, to be sure! Only do this, and carry it out in practice, and we should have the slave trade legalized, and slavery protected in all the Territories, and States. The trouble in respect to "the Republicans" is, that while they "concede that the States of the *South* have a right to hold slaves as property" they will not apply the principle to the *rest* of the country, and are therefore "*sectional*." It must be confessed that there is some show of reason in this?

An Old Acquaintance.—[illegible]—There is a tap-root to this [illegible] business, deeper than slavery, independent of slavery, of which, in truth, slavery itself is but a shoot. The [illegible] why certain states cherish slavery, is the same that disposes them to aristocratic institutions generally, and confines their love of country within the narrow and exclusive circle of their own influence and interests. South Carolina is the representative state on one side, as Massachusetts is on the other, and there is nothing accidental in the marked contrast and antagonism between these states. It existed in the Revolution—it existed before the Revolution—and from the first settlement of either state. South Carolina was settled by [illegible] cavaliers, was nearly lost to Independence in consequence of her tory population, was scarcely dragged into the [illegible] by her tory population, has been kept in [illegible] and [illegible] from the same cause, and has now [illegible] by the very [illegible], which her [illegible] power.

In [illegible] South Carolina was never [illegible] American state, and [illegible] in proportion to the intensity of these twin passions, state arrogance and love of slavery. If slavery were abolished to-day in South Carolina, the innate toryism which is its root, would, [illegible] against the rights and equality of labor, against the [illegible] and institutions of the North and against the [illegible] which [illegible] to the broad [illegible] of a truly free [illegible]. We shall never become [illegible] except in name until a complete industrial revolution shall have [illegible] society in the South, raised labor to its honors and peopled the walks of business and public life with [illegible]—Industry. The masters of slaves can never love liberty and equality, nor yield a willing submission to law. Half-way political liberty is an impossibility. The principle of equality among all men, is the only foundation of freedom for any [illegible] and [illegible] law.—*N. Y. Sun.*

WHERE THE SOUTH IS DRIFTING

From the Philadelphia Press.

Washington, Sunday, Dec. 30, 1860.

The [illegible] having taken possession of the telegraph wires at Charleston, and it being unsafe to send any dispatches from any other Southern station giving a true account of the condition of things in that section, I have been enabled to glean from conversations with [illegible] lately arrived in this city from Charleston, Mobile, New-Orleans, Savannah and Memphis, and from reading certain private letters the following facts.

That starvation is impending in many parts of South Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana.

That there is little or no money in circulation in the Cotton States, notwithstanding the suspension of nearly all the Southern banks, their paper has greatly depreciated.

That even Virginia notes are far below par in this city.

That the necessity of raising money to support war establishments in the different Cotton States, intended for the double purpose of resisting the Federal Government and of putting down local trouble, alarms the property-holders, many of whom would retire to the North, but they are forced to pay these taxes in order to prevent suspicion, and are compelled to remain lest a portion of their families might be retained as hostages.

The constant fears are entered of a rising of the slaves in most of the Southern States. These fears whether real or imaginary, are producing universal alarm.

Letters received this morning by a Southern lady represent the feeling on this subject as intense.

The bitter divisions are growing up among the politicians in the South—some produced by disputes on the question of secession, some by the horrors of forced taxation, and still more by the fact that South Carolina is in the attitude of enforcing a Reign of Terror, to which all men must submit, in order to save reputation and life.

The Supremacy of the United States Constitution and Laws.—It is admitted by the advocates of Secession that the General Government may suppress rebellion in a State, or, in other words, coerce the individual rebels, however numerous, provided the State in its corporate capacity refrains from indorsing the resistance of the people. But, according to the theory of the Secessionists, the State may at any time and for any cause declare itself out of the Union, and thus paralyze the arm of United States authority.

But just at this point the second clause or paragraph of the sixth article of the Constitution comes into play, with the declaration that "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, *anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.*"

It would be impossible for language to be plainer than this, or more effectually to exclude the constructive right of secession. It will be seen, also, that this clause binds the State Judges by their solemn oaths, to make the United States laws and Constitution paramount to State laws and Constitutions. Now whatever exception may be made as to the supremacy of United States laws, none whatever can be taken as to the Constitution, and to legal and Constitutional [illegible] held under it. South Carolina has not pretended, and cannot, that the election of Mr. Lincoln was in any respect unconstitutional. He was born a free white citizen of the United States, he is of lawful age, and his election depends upon the vote of no State in which there is a doubt that the majority was in his favor. For any State to resist his inauguration, [illegible] to attempt a secession from the Union on account of his election, is a simple nullity, and must be so treated by the Judges of all the States, including South Carolina. To do otherwise [illegible] the [illegible] of their official oaths.

The [illegible] clause of the sixth article of the Constitution is equally binding upon all officers, State and General. It declares that:

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution."

The inference is irresistible from this clause that no man who holds any office under the General or State Government, can give aid or encouragement to secession from the Union, without committing an act of perjury. The right of secession is [illegible] a revolutionary right, and every official [illegible] who would maintain [illegible] must [illegible] his office, whether it be conferred by the General or State Government.

It is equally clear that all officers of the General Government are bound to aid in enforcing the laws, no matter who [illegible], and that the President and Cabinet, members of Congress and the Judiciary are especially bound to do all that men can do to maintain the supremacy of the laws and Constitution of the United States.—*Times.*

BEWARE OF COMPROMISES

From the *N. Y. Tribune* (Jan. 4) warns the people to beware of compromises by their Republican Representatives at Washington—as follows:

BEWARE!

[illegible] weeks ago we warned the Republicans of the Free States that a [illegible] Washington [illegible] the [illegible] and we [illegible] them to [illegible] known to their Senators and Representatives [illegible]. We have reason to [illegible] that [illegible]. We now say [illegible] than before [illegible] policy that shall humble the North and [illegible] party [illegible]. We [illegible] upon them [illegible] make their [illegible] at Washington. To this end [illegible] journals, and by letters and other means of communication, so that their Senators and Representatives may have a clear knowledge of the [illegible] of public sentiment at home. Let the friends of Free Labor and Free Government [illegible]. The [illegible] impends. There is no time for delay."

And what were the "vital doctrines for which" Republicans "struggled in the recent Presidential [illegible]?" Was it for the freedom and security of all the people of the United States? Was it for the abolition of slavery in the Federal District, "under exclusive legislation of Congress?" Was it for the prohibition of the slave trade between the States? Was it for the "vital doctrine of "No more Slave States"? Was it for the Federal exclusion of slavery from the Territories? Was it for the Repeal of the Fugitive Slave bill? Was it for recommending to the States the defence of "State Rights" by efficient Personal Liberty bills which should put a stop to slave hunting in the non-slaveholding States?

If it were neither the one or the other of all these—and we feel quite safe in saying that it was *not*—we should like to be told what it was? What "vital doctrine" was there, in the contest, which is now in danger of being compromised, *given up*, by the Republican Representatives in Congress? We can think of but one "vital doctrine" of that contest, namely that the Constitution does not, of itself, carry slavery into the Territories and the States.

Does the Tribune mean to say that there is danger that the Republican Representatives in Congress are in danger of giving up *that* doctrine? What else *has* they to give up? And with nothing but *that*, how could even that be retained? The alarms of the Tribune, we fear, are but too well founded.

The Cincinnati Gazette, a prominent Republican paper, suggests, as alternatives, two modes of pacification.

1. Restoring the Missouri Compromise line, as to all the Territories of the United States, in the same extent as before, is favored by many. This is nothing less than giving reparation to the North, so far as possible, for that most wanton and unjustifiable act through which a good understanding between the two sections was destroyed.

Republicans can consent to this without violation of the Chicago platform. Will the South consent to this? Will Douglas and his party followers [illegible] a [illegible] of their own acts? We [illegible] them on [illegible] ground [illegible].

But we anticipate that the South, and even Douglas himself, will not consent to this. They will probably demand Congressional recognition and protection of Slavery south of the line. To this, [illegible] Republicans can [illegible] be expected to assent.

2. There remains the other alternative [illegible]. Is not this mode of pacification practicable? The Chicago platform, to our certain knowledge, was expressly framed with a view to [illegible]. A large portion of the Republican party—perhaps a large majority—have long felt willing to leave the question of Slavery in the Territories to adjust itself according to the laws of emigration and the course of the seasons, if only Federal intervention is [illegible].

And so we have the testimony of the [illegible] to that fact that the Federal limitation of Slavery, by excluding it from the Territories, is no longer a principle or measure of the Republican party.

The Principia.

[illegible]

SOME THINGS TO BE THOUGHT OF.

[illegible] Mr. [illegible] Republican party [illegible] States may be [illegible] have been [illegible] and understood [illegible] in the Union, obey the laws [illegible] the public peace. But what if the slave States [illegible] the execution of the laws [illegible] from the Union, or make war upon the United States? Will the Republican pledges be held binding? South Carolina, whether regarded as a foreign nation or as a revolting portion of the Union, has actually levied war on the United States, and has thus subjected herself to the usages and fortunes of war. If regarded as in a state of rebellion, the Habeas Corpus may be suspended, and military law proclaimed. "The war power of Congress" to abolish slavery, as a means of national defence, was maintained by John Quincy Adams, without contradiction, in the House of Representatives, years ago. If the South Carolina rebellion cannot be put down otherwise than by liberating all the slaves of all the slave States, what consideration should hinder its being done?

When South Carolina seceded, she threw aside all the "Compromises of the Constitution," real or imaginary. The seceders' theory that the Constitution is a treaty between States, that the Union is a confederacy of States, from which any state may secede, is a theory that places a seceding State outside of all the protection of the Treaty which she has annulled. She is to be treated, then, like any *other* nation at war with the United States.

Is it to be supposed that the "fire-eaters" of the South, in their improvident haste, have forgotten all this? Or is it because they have *not* forgotten it, that they are threatening to seize the national capitol, and prevent the inauguration of the President elect? Have they considered the dilemma in which even the successful execution of this project would place them? With an outraged and indignant Northern population against them, and with *no Federal Government* in operation, after the 4th of March, to interpose any barrier to a Northern reaction against the Southern revolutionists, what defence would the slaveholders have, either against Nat Turner insurrections or John Brown invasions, or both combined? President Lincoln and his party, if in power, and in the absence of Southern nullification, secession and military aggression, would feel bound, by the Republican platform and professions to put down slave insurrections and John Brown invasions. But *without* any Federal Administration, what should prevent a trial of strength between the North and the slaveholders, the slaves being, of course, on the side of the North? Have the slaveholders calculated the chances of such a contest?

[illegible] the programme that, in the [illegible] the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, the *present* administration would "hold over" [illegible] have expressed it, and under the [illegible] lead of our present Chief Magistrate keep the Northerners in subjection! Such an attempt would be [illegible] treason, and would [illegible] the non-[illegible] States.

It strikes us that here are some things for the slaveholders to think of [illegible]. We are not partisans of Mr. Lincoln, have never advocated [illegible] in the [illegible] of his [illegible] at all. [illegible] the Northern people of all parties [illegible] ex-[illegible] sustaining [illegible] against the Revolutionary [illegible] of slaveholders.

[illegible] Congress [illegible] slavery, [illegible] from the slaves. [illegible] would [illegible] John Brown [illegible] would [illegible]. The slaves would have nothing to fight for—and northern [illegible] would have nothing to fight [illegible]. *There would be peace of course.*

[illegible] Congress would [illegible] what it might [illegible] long ago. The Constitution authorizes [illegible] da[illegible] pr[illegible] gained. But when [illegible] National [illegible] above all written Constitutions and [illegible]. This truth has to be recognized on both sides. The [illegible] of slavery paramount.

The times on which we are [illegible] require [illegible] freedom, justice, and humanity, to make the interests of the paramount as a matter of [illegible] in addition to the higher obligations of duty.

The danger of the country is not secession, disunion, disorganization, derangement of business or financial distress. Of these there is little danger and would be none, were we firm in doing our duty. Evils like these, should they come, might be manfully borne, and survived.

The real danger is degradation of character in the sight of mankind, the loss of self-respect, the searing of the conscience, the displeasure of the Almighty, the curses instead of the blessings of those ready to perish, all which must come upon us and crush us, if we fail to open our mouths for the dumb, to execute judgment for the oppressed, to do to others as we would have others do unto us.

The *secession* we are in danger of, is the separating of ourselves from the least of Christ's brethren, the poorest of the poor, the treatment of whom he will regard as the treatment of himself, when he comes in the glory of his Father, and with the holy angels, to judge the world. The disunion that threatens us is fellowship with unrighteousness, which is disunion with our Creator. The disorganization to be dreaded is that which, by refusing to protect human rights, undermines the foundations of all protecting government and all valid law. The derangement of business that stares us in the face, is that which results, under the Divine Government, from with-holding the hire of the laborer. The financial distress with which we are threatened is the canker upon the gold and silver of those whose harvests are reaped down without payment of wages. So long as God lives, so long as his throne stands, so long as the sovereign nation of South Carolina cannot scale the battlements of Heaven and dethrone the Almighty, so long the path of national duty, in the deliverance of the oppressed, will be the path—the *only* path of permanent national safety unity, tranquility, and prosperity. It is unrighteousness that estranges, divides, disorganizes, deranges, perplexes, impoverishes, and destroys. But the fruit of righteousness is unity, peace, security, and assurance, forever.

THE COUNSELS OF AHITHOPEL.

The Special Correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing from Washington City, Dec 22, of the Conciliation Committees, in the Senate, and in the House, says

"I think the case turns upon the question of whether an agreement can be made to a partition of territory between the Slave and Free States. This is the nub of the controversy when winnowed from its chaff. All the other points I fancy, can be managed. But the concession on the main one, of a partition of territory after the plan of the Missouri Compromise, is the sticking place. The revolutionists in the Gulf States don't want to be satisfied with this, but the [illegible] Slave States, or those in them who are opposed to dissolving the Union, consider that the [illegible] would force the [illegible] to desist. *The [illegible] under the form of a constitutional guaranty.* No ordinary legislative action will satisfy the slaveholders. As Mr. Toombs says, it must take the shape of [illegible] *guaranty* or he would not give a fig for it, for the Abolitionists are treacherous and would repeal the [illegible] to-morrow if they had a chance."

And so *a change of the Constitution* meets us, at every point. In this case, it is easy to see why this change is needed. The Supreme Court has decided that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional and it would hardly do to declare it constitutional again so soon. The Old Compromise was forced upon us by a Southern threat of [illegible]. It was repealed under the same threat. And now it is to be demanded of us, again, under the same threat! Will the North be brow-beaten again?

And if they should, what would become of the Dred Scott decision, which is based so largely on the assumption that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional?

The same correspondent of the Tribune, Dec 2[illegible], says again

"The [illegible] have already got their hands full of a [illegible] absurd [illegible] what they will [illegible] re-[illegible]. For example, [illegible] North-west in regard to the mouth of [illegible] Mississippi river, and [illegible] Mississippi Valley, and [illegible] Pennsylvania and New York [illegible] A[illegible] will accept the terms they dictate. But New England, with her [illegible] Senators, is not to be allowed the privilege of [illegible] in. [illegible] whatever. The fanatics of that district of country are to be fenced out at all hazards. You may think this a joke. It is no joke at all but a seriously entertained project. Take out the twelve New England Senators and their [illegible] representation in the lower branch, and the slaveholding section have it all their own way again, in the new Confederacy. That it takes two to make a bargain may be innocently suggested, but that is no maxim of the South. Their plan is have things *their own* way without reference to anybody else."

The slaveholders cutting off New England! Cutting off the land of Daniel Webster, Edward Everett, Caleb Cushing, and Nehemiah Adams. Cutting off the Cotton lords of the North, the natural and willing allies and tools of the Cotton lords of the South—cutting off the way influences that have been most effectual in checking the radical political abolition that the slaveholders most dread—cutting off the very region in which even abolitionists have been led to concede the Constitutionality of slavery—cutting off all these, yet strengthening their connection with the more radical West and North-west, wherein resides three-fourths of the radical political abolition of the country, the region most thoroughly saturated with the doctrine of a Federal abolition of slavery in the States!

"SOUTHERN TRADE."

Our readers, we trust, will have profited by a perusal of the article on this subject, copied from *the Times*, into our last number. There have been some other articles in the same paper, containing information connected with that topic, from which we should be glad to make extracts, if we could find room. We welcome the diffusion of light among the people, from whatever quarter it may come, and whatever of darkness, on other topics connected with slavery may yet envelop the journals that give light, of any description. A money loving city like New York, ought to know something on subjects connected with its own commerce, especially at a time when it is tempted to sacrifice liberty, truth, and righteousness, for the sake of supposed commercial advantages. It would be mortifying to have sold *these* for the gains of Southern commerce and then to have it demonstrated that the balance sheet of that commerce, instead of showing a net gain, exhibits a positive *loss!*

The article from *the Times* already before our readers is, of itself, sufficient for the purpose, with all prudent, business men. With the "fanatical abolitionists"—"the reckless agitators"—"the men of one idea, who forget everything else in their one idea of liberating the negroes"—the facts presented by *the Times* and many others along with them, have been familiar, for more than twenty years past. In speeches at anti-Slavery Annual Meetings and Conventions, by anti-Slavery lecturers, and in anti-Slavery Journals, the [illegible] facts and considerations presented in part by *the Times* [illegible] in the [illegible] year of its age, have been [illegible] ever since the great commercial revulsion of 1837. There is scarcely a district school house in central and western New York in which they have not been discussed. The organization of the Liberty party in 1840, from which [illegible] true [illegible] and [illegible] had its origin, in some measure, in considerations growing out of these facts. Not only in a moral, political and philanthropic point of view, but also from a pecuniary and financial view it had been abundantly proved by the [illegible] to all who would listen to them, that [illegible] slavery was the great [illegible] question of the day, of more importance to the wealth of the nation, particularly of our manufacturing Districts, [illegible], and the [illegible] itself, than all questions arising out of Banks, Tariffs, or modes of collecting and depositing the national revenue.

Country farmers and village mechanics, or large portions of them, understood all this, more than twenty years ago. But the trouble was, and has continued to be, that the great merchants, and great capitalists and great financiers, and great politicians, and great journals of the great cities could not be persuaded to give their attention to the [illegible] at all.

[illegible] by abolitionists before *the Times* had an existence.

"BRITISH AID MISSION."

Our readers will be glad to hear that Dr Cheever's mission to Great Britain, in behalf of the "Church of the Puritans," is not likely to prove a failure. We have it from a source which we think reliable, that he continues to meet with encouraging success. More and better than even this. He is likely to give the British Christian public a more full and accurate view of the anti-slavery struggle in America, especially in the Churches, than has before been communicated to them.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The measure of reducing the free blacks to slavery has been before the Legislature of South Carolina, recently for consideration, and a committee has reported against it, as impolitic, wicked, and inhuman—an argument equally forcible against slaveholding in any case. They state that the free blacks own a large amount of property, and that some of them are slaveholders! ["Can't take of themselves!" "Slavery the normal condition of the blacks," &c., &c. What becomes of those falsehoods, now ?]

DISCUSSIONS ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT.—The question, "What are the duties of the people, in connection with Civil Government?" was discussed last Tuesday Evening, and will be *further* discussed, next Tuesday Evening, ½ past 7, at the 1st Cong. Church, corner South 3d and 11th Streets, Williamsburgh.

News of the Day.

PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS OF SECESSION.

The South Carolina experiment of independent and sovereign nationality does not seem to prosper quite as well as could have been desired by the sanguine friends of the measure. When she proclaimed her [illegible] nationality and sovereign independence, her claim on the Federal Government for [illegible] should have been considered [illegible]. But [illegible]

[illegible]

As might be expected, the South Carolina Convention in this awkward predicament, adjourns, [illegible] and the members [illegible] their homes, leaving the National Sovereignty of South Carolina to manage its concerns and carry on its war with the United States, with the help of United States mails, and United States Custom houses, as it best can, either with or without the direction of the Governor and State Legislature. Whether it is expected that the Federal Treasury at Washington will defray the expenses of the defunct South Carolina Convention, on the same principle that it defrays the expense of running the mails, we are not yet informed. Some misgivings, on that point may have hastened the dissolution of the Convention, since Cobb and Floyd have left the Cabinet, and Buchanan has come under the influence of Scott and Holt. The rumor is, that the Convention, collectively and individually, found a financial difficulty in the way of a more protracted session, and having neither State or National Treasury to draw upon for board bills, were compelled to separate.

The change of sentiment and feeling, North of Mason and Dixon's line is evidently producing its effects at the South. It is to be hoped that the late developments of weakness on the part of the sovereign nation of South Carolina will produce corresponding effects at the North and at the seat of Government. Grave deliberations upon proposals for further "Compromise" with the South," or, more properly, of still more servile *submissions* to the *slaveholders*, appear inexpressibly ridiculous in the light of the South Carolina demonstrations now witnessed. Should the rest of the Gulf States follow the example of South Carolina in her farcical attempts at secession, the people of the non-slaveholding States, we suspect, would be put in a way of getting their eyes opened to their own equally ridiculous and wicked policy of sacrificing principle, truth, duty, liberty, and humanity, on the altar of a short sighted expediency, and in order to conciliate "our brethren of the South," and prevent pecuniary disaster in the free labor States!

Already the merchants and capitalists of New York City—the very last portion of the northern people to learn—are beginning to learn something of the dollar and cent part of the problem. Some time ago, an application to conservative bankers in the City for a loan of half a million on South Carolina State Stock, was met with a cold shoulder, in Wall street. And just now we heard that an order from South Carolina on a New York house for flour, was answered with the [illegible] "*Eat Cotton.*" We cannot commend this blunt style of correspondence between [illegible] pro-slavery [illegible] and their southern [illegible] lords, but we shall be glad if they learn [illegible] their former [illegible] and servility.

It is now generally understood and admitted, we believe, that the [illegible] programme was, to seize the National Capitol, Navy Yard, and public buildings at Washington City, prevent the inauguration of Lincoln, and [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] *Times*

The [illegible] which the leaders of the revolution in South Carolina have brought upon themselves [illegible] elsewhere. We learn, for instance, through a private letter from a perfectly responsible source in Charleston, that the other day a body of twenty Minute Men from the country entered a large private house in that city and demanded dinner. A dinner was given them, and then they demanded ten dollars each, saying that they had not come to Charleston for nothing, and the money was furnished also.

Another fact of still greater significance has come to our knowledge. *Gov. Pickens has written to an officer of high rank in the United States Army, a native of South Carolina, who is loyal to the stars and stripes, requesting him to come to Charleston and protect them from the mob.* The officer has declined, saying that he can serve his country elsewhere, and that he does not wish to have any part in the proceedings now going forward in that State.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

EXPULSION OF AN UNITED STATES OFFICER.

WASHINGTON, Jan. [illegible]

A sergant, who was left at Fort Moultrie after Major Anderson transferred his command, has arrived here. When he went up to Charleston from Sullivan's Island, he was promptly arrested and taken before a magistrate. As no complaint could be lodged against him, he was released but admonished to leave the city. He made several attempts to reach Fort Sumter, but the surveillance was too perfect, and no communication is permitted except under the orders of the new authorities.

DISAFFECTION AMONG THE REBELS.

Is is stated that much disaffection exists among the German and Irish volunteer troops, who are taken away from their business and homes to perform military duty, while the Secession leaders are enjoying the luxury of treason comfortably and without any personal exposure.

THE REIGN OF TERROR BEGUN IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

From the Albany Evening Journal.

It has been noticed and wondered at that the South Carolina Legislature and Convention have as yet devised no means to raise the money indispensable to carry on a separate national existence, with the exception of the Loan of $400,000, and that nothing is published in regard to the takers of that. But there is a phase of this matter which is sedulously concealed from Northern ears and eyes. It is beginning to leak out now through private but reliable information, that merchants and other men of property are *compelled by threats of personal violence to become subscribers to the State Loan.* Some who were told that unless they paid $1,[illegible] each, their houses would be torn down over their heads, have paid it and then fled for their own safety and that of their families, to [illegible] North. It is also reported, and there is no reason to doubt the truth of the report, that *a tax has been* [illegible] *$1[illegible] per head for each Slave* owned by them—a tax so onerous that, in [illegible] the Slaves will be [illegible] and sold in order to meet it. Of course all this is kept [illegible] out of the published news and official proceedings. [illegible]

DOINGS AND SAYINGS AT WASHINGTON.

[illegible]

Liberty bill. It was generally supported by the Republicans—only Tappan, Washburn and Morrill, Republicans, and Phelps, of Missouri, and one or two other Democrats voting against it. Only about half a dozen Southern men now attend the meetings of the Committee—all the extensionists having deserted.

What an outrage! What an insult! "*Illegally removing all cause for Personal Liberty laws!*" How? By making the Fugitive Slave Bill worse than it was before. No pretense at all at the North—any slaveholder a right to come or send North, seize any man he pleases, black or white, bond or free—hurry him at once to the South, without even a hearing before a Commissioner, or allowing time for his family or neighbors to be apprized of the fact. "A jury trial" at the South—not at the North, where he has perhaps resided from childhood and in the midst of neighbors who could testify to his freedom, not one of whom could [illegible] at the South, without [illegible]! Did the Northern Republicans who generally voted for it expect ever to get another Northern vote? Were they aware that they were voting to place themselves in the very predicament above described? They were, unless some distinction of race or color was made in the proposition, of which we hear nothing. And even if there were, how, without a Northern jury trial, would any security be afforded by it?

AID FOR ANDERSON.—The Star of the West, Capt. McGowan, has been sent from Governors Island in New York harbor—a national post—with a body of U. S. troops, to re-enforce Maj. Anderson, at Fort Sumpter. They are probably there, at the time of our writing.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 7.

PROTECTION FOR THE CAPITAL.

Three companies of flying Artillery are on their way to this city. One company will be posted at or near Judiciary Square, in the center of the city, one on the Capitol Hill, near to the east front of the Capitol, and one at the square near the President's House.

PENSACOLA, KEY WEST, AND HAMPTON ROADS.

The important post of Pensacola, Florida, is now well guarded. There is one company of infantry, with two vessels of war, at that station. Key West, also another highly important station, with one of the finest harbors in the world, and holding the key of the Gulf of Mexico, is occupied by a sufficient force to protect it against any attack the revolutionists can make upon it. Hampton Roads, the other naval station in the South, is likewise in a secure position.

WASHINGTON, Monday, Jan. 7, 1861.

MR. LINCOLN'S CABINET.

The following gentlemen have been invited to seats in the Cabinet: Messrs. Seward, Cameron, Bates, Smith, and Welles. The invitation to Mr. Cameron indicates the Treasury of War Department, but without "definitely determining" which. It is quite probable that the two Southern appoints will not be kept open until Mr. Lincoln reaches this city, where he is expected some time in February, as events in the mean time may have an important bearing upon the selections.

JUDGE TANEY is reported to have said that he expects to administer the oath of Office to President Lincoln and MR. BUCHANAN expects to ride in the carriage with him to the inauguration, and run the risk of getting shot.

TIMIDITY IN VIRGINIA.

Virginians in the counties of the interior, are already exhibiting the same kind of tremors and timidity that was manifested at the time of the John Brown invasion. Such is the intelligence brought into this city to-day. Jan. 7.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 5.

The scenes of the last few days have disclosed plans and purposes of the revolutionists that run quite ahead of anything expected of them. They have been talking all along of "peaceable and constitutional secession." But what do we see, since Floyd went out of the War Department? All through the South the State authorities, or the mob, rushing upon the forts and arsenals of the Federal Government, capturing them where they are not protected, and threatening them where they are, and garrisoning them with State troops. This is treasonably done in open and lawless violation of all decency and before the secession of the State in which these things are taking place is even considered; treason [illegible] done while the State is in the regular fellowship of her sister States, and while her Representatives and Senators are sitting and voting in the two Houses of Congress, and drawing their pay from the Federal Treasury.

It is enough to say that a more reckless and determined attempt to overturn and destroy a Government was never set on foot in any country than exists in this to-day, and every hour's development proves it. But for Anderson's movement, which precipitated Floyd's resignation and partially exploded the scheme, this city would have been in the hands of the traitors before the 4th of March, and a Revolutionary Government proclaimed from the Capitol, and the de jure Administration compelled to contest positions with the de facto one. How serious would have been that complication, every man can see. The question now is, how near this result can [illegible]. J. S. P.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

The Secessionists are in great good spirits this morning. All their well laid plans are, according to their own story, working admirably. They claim to have complete possession of the South, with a large loyalty interest in the North. The consummation of their grand scheme will be the seizure of the Northern Capitol. I notice that some of the Northern journals regard this as ridiculous, and laugh at the idea of the South pouring twenty thousand men into the City of Washington, within four weeks. They will laugh still more when I tell them that the South leaned largely upon Northern aid from secretly organized associations, the chief of which is known as the "Knights of the Golden Circle." The leaders of this declare that the circle can and will contribute 120,000 men. Their grand robbery of the Treasury will cover up the smaller ones by seizing the public buildings and all the public documents, which will be handed over to Cobb, Floyd and Co. They will then declare to the world that the Government *de facto* of the United States still exists, and with the capital in their possession, they expect to be recognized by the foreign Ministers resident here, while the North is to be declared out of the Union. It is then claimed by these Wise men of the South that they have friends enough in the North to control that section and compel it to recognize the power or party having possession of the capital, so that the spilling of human blood, should there be any, is to be transferred to the Northern States.

The city is being rapidly filled up with young men from the South. They mostly congregate at Brown's and the National. J. S. P.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

The following resolution, offered by Mr. Adrain of New-Jersey, was passed by 124 Yeas to 56 Nays: in the House of Representatives.

"*Resolved*, That we fully approve the bold and patriotic act of Major Anderson in withdrawing from Fort Moultrie to Fort Sumter, and the determination of the President to maintain that fearless officer in his present condition, and we will support the President in all constitutional measures to enforce the laws and preserve the Union."

Among those who sustained this resolution, were a majority of the Democratic representatives of the North, and several manly and patriotic members from Southern States. This resolution is worth more as a basis for the permanent settlement of the great question and for the preservation of the Union than all the propositions of all the compromise committees.—*Tribune.*

VOICE OF A CONNECTICUT CHURCH ON FAST DAY.—The following were adopted by the Congregational Church in Jewett City, Conn., at the public services of Fast day.

I. *Resolved*, That this church and congregation assembled on the 4th day of January 1861, according to the Proclamation of the President of the nation and also of the Governor of this State, to keep a season of fasting and prayer on account of the distress of the nation, deem it proper while humbling themselves before God, to put on record their judgment of the exigency that has called for such a proclamation.

II. *Resolved*, That we deem it owing, under God, solely to the existence and audacity of Slavery; and we hold it to be the manifest and imperative duty of the President of the United States in this exigency as "the Minister of God, who beareth not the sword in vain," promptly to enforce the laws, and to put down the rebellion and treason, which have been plotted and perpetrated in South Carolina by the use (if need be) of all the disposable force of the Army and Navy of the United States.

III. *Resolved*, That we further declare our deliberate opinion that all the Christian people of the country should, and that an overwhelming majority of them will patriotically sustain the President in such a [illegible] suppression of the reckless treason [illegible].

IV. *Resolved*, That we declare finally, that if, as being the Executive Head, and expressing the collective sovereignty of a great nation, the President does not do this, but allows a treacherous conspiracy of rebels to have its way, it is due at once [illegible] people [illegible] the Senate of the United States.

A true copy. Attest. HENRY T. [illegible].

HELP FOR KANSAS is still needed.—The Committee [illegible] solicit further supplies.

SECRETARY THOMPSON has [illegible] the Interior. Good!

MR. LINCOLN'S CABINET.—Report says that Mr. Lincoln has invited Edward Bates, of Missouri, Wm. H. Seward of New York, Mr. Cameron of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Wells of Connecticut, into his Cabinet—[illegible] declines, and that Mr. Seward has not decided whether to accept. Uncertain.

MAYOR WOOD of New York, in a message to the Common Council, in which he expresses [illegible] as it would greatly [illegible] following sentiments:

"With our greatest [illegible] of the [illegible] friendly relations and a common sympathy. We have not participated in the warfare upon their [illegible] or their domestic institutions. While [illegible] State have unfortunately been [illegible] with the fanatical spirit which actuates a portion of the people of New England, the City of New York has unfalteringly preserved the integrity of its principles in adherence to the compromises of the constitution and the equal rights of the people of all the States."

After thus giving countenance to Southern [illegible] he goes into a long argument setting forth reasons why *New York City* should also secede from the *State* of New-York and from the Union, on account, partly, of State Legislation oppressive to the City! He closes as follows:

"When Disunion has become a fixed and certain fact, why may not New York disrupt the bands which bind her to a venal and corrupt master—to a people and a party that have plundered her revenues, attempted to ruin her commerce, taken away the power of self-government, and destroyed the Confederacy of which she was the proud Empire City? Amid the gloom which the present and prospective condition of things must cast over the country, New York, as a *free City*, may shed the only light and hope for a future reconstruction of our once blessed confederacy.

"Yet I am not prepared to recommend the violence implied in these views. In stating this argument in favor of freedom, "peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must," let me not be misunderstood. The redress can be found only in appeals to the magnanimity of the people of the whole State. The events of the past two months have no doubt effected a change in the popular sentiment of the State on National politics. This change may bring us the desired relief, and we may be able to appeal of the laws to which I have referred, and a consequent restoration of our corporate rights.

FERNANDO WOOD, Mayor.

Jaunary 7 1861.

The Mayor, it is believed, has now used up pretty effectually, the little remnant of his popularity with his fellow citizens, who will not thank him for lending his official influence in support of disorganization and disunion.

PROPOSED "NINE MONTHS SLAVERY" IN NEW YORK.—A notice has been given in the Legislature of New York of the introduction of a Bill "to authorize holding slaves in New York for nine months,"—equivalent to a proposal to disband the Republican party, in this State if its members vote for it, and to raise an unprecedented storm of indignation in the State if it passes. *The people* demand, and will ere long have a *bill* abolishing slave-hunting, in this State instead of the re-enactment of exploded slavery [illegible].

SPICY CORRESPONDENCE.—Many of our readers probably know that the Mayor of this city in his Thanksgiving proclamation, made a very impertinent [illegible] remark, to the effect that the people of this city had very little to be thankful for. His impertinence was rebuked in several pulpits on Thanksgiving day, and especially by the Rev. Dr. Tyng, Rector of the church in which Mayor Wood and his family have long been worshippers. According to the New York correspondent of The Buffalo Commercial, the Mayor was absent at Washington at the time, but on his return, the following correspondence, in substance, took place.

MAYOR WOOD TO DR. TYNG.

MAYOR'S OFFICE, DEC. [illegible]

REV. AND DEAR SIR: Believing it the province of the Church to preach Christ crucified, and I am only [illegible] believing that to political preaching most of the ills which afflict our unhappy country are directly traceable, you will excuse me for thus notifying you of my withdrawal from your pastoral ministrations at St. George's. Your reference to the Mayor's Proclamation on Thanksgiving day, were as unchristian as they were improper and uncalled for. Had I been present on the occasion I should have deemed it a [illegible]

[illegible]resent them, by leaving my pew, and ta[illegible] the members [illegible] with me [illegible] you will grow wise as you grow old.

I remain your [illegible] [illegible] W[illegible]

To the Rev. S[illegible] A. T[illegible]

St. George's Church, Stuyvesant [illegible].

[illegible]

St. George's R[illegible], Dec. [illegible]

The Rev. Dr Tyng[illegible] to Mr Fernando Wood with his regrets that [illegible] of wholesome and deserved ad[illegible] have [illegible] him to separate from the com[illegible] of the Saints. As it is however the Rector of St. George's [illegible] refrain from reiterating on this occasion an [illegible] belief in the [illegible] doc[illegible]—so often [illegible] to by his friend, Mr. Wood—that

> "While the lamp holds out to burn
> The [illegible] sinner may return."

Mr F[illegible] W[illegible], Mayor's Office, City Hall Park.

THE REIGN OF TERROR IN GEORGIA.

The *Southern Confederacy*, (published at Atlanta, Georgia,) a paper which has been fighting most gallantly for the Union and the laws, says of the late election for members of the Georgia Convention:

"It is a notable fact that, wherever the 'Minute-Men,' as they are called, have had an organization, those counties have voted, by large majorities, for immediate secession. Those that they could not control by persuasion and coaxing, *they dragooned and bullied, by threats, [illegible] and sneers.* By this means thousands of good citizens were induced to vote the immediate secession ticket, through timidity. Besides, the towns and cities have been flooded with sensation despatches and inflammatory rumors manufactured in Washington City for the especial occasion. To be candid, there never has been as much lieing and bullying practiced in the same length of time, since the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, as has been in the recent state campaign. The fault has been at Washington City—from that cess-pool has eminated all the abominations that ever cursed a free people."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The Special Message of President Buchanan in reference to the present agitated condition of the country, and particularly regarding the recent action of South Carolina, was yesterday sent to Congress.—*Times of Thursday.*

The President, in his Message, repeats his conviction that "no State has a right, by its own act, to secede from the Union, or throw off Federal obligations at pleasure." He also repeats that the President must collect the revenues and enforce the laws. Yet he adds—

The fact cannot be disguised that we are in the midst of a great revolution. Therefore, I recommend the question to Congress as the only human tribunal under Providence possessing the power to meet the existing emergency. To them, exclusively, belongs the power to declare war or to authorize the employment of military force in all cases contemplated by the Constitution, and they alone possess the power to remove all the grievances which might lead to war, and to secure peace and union to this distracted country. On them, and on them alone, rests the responsibility. The Union is a sacred trust, left by our revolutionary fathers for their descendants, and never did any other people inherit so rich a legacy.

I therefore appeal through you to the people of the country to declare in their might that the Union must and shall be preserved by all constitutional means. I most earnestly recommend that you devote yourselves to the question how this can be accomplished in peace. All other questions, when compared with this sink into insignificance. The present is no time for palliatives. Prompt action is required. A delay in Congress to prescribe or recommend a distinct and practical proposition for conciliation, may drive us to a point from which it will be almost impossible to recede. A common ground on which [illegible] and harmony may be produced, is surely not unattainable.

The [illegible] compromise, by letting the North have exc[illegible] of the territory above a certain line, and [illegible] Southern institutions [illegible] below that line ought to receive universal approbation. In itself, indeed, it may not be entirely satisfactory, but when the alternative [illegible] [illegible] of the Union, it is [illegible] [illegible] will [illegible] It is said that serious appre[illegible] entertained, in which I do [illegible] this District may be [illegible] before the 4th of March next. In any event it will be my duty [illegible] [illegible]

The Times says:

It [illegible] [illegible] failed.

Yet the Times [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

POSTSCRIPT.

WAR UPON THE UNITED STATES BY SOUTH CAROLINA!

The [illegible] "Star of the West" with U. S. troops and provisions for Major Anderson at Fort Sumpter has been fired upon and driven back to sea. The first telegram was [illegible], but is now (Friday morning) confirmed.

We have at last full reports of what took place when the Star of the West attempted to enter Charleston Harbor. She was fired upon from Morris Island and Fort Moultrie. Maj. Anderson then demanded from Gov. Pickens permission for her to enter, backing it with a threat to open his guns upon any battery that might fire upon her. Gov. Pickens refused permission, and Maj. Anderson decided to refer the matter to Washington, Lieut. Talbot being dispatched thither as a special messenger.—*N. Y. Times.*

MISSISSIPPI has passed an ordinance of secession.

The U. S. forts in Louisiana have been seized by the Revolutionists.

Family Miscellany.

"OVER THE RIVER."

[The following, slightly varied from the publication in which it was found, by AMANDA GOODELL, was selected by her, as expressive of her feelings just before her decease, and were read at her funeral.]

> Over the river they beckon to me—
> Loved ones who've crossed to the farther side;
> The gleam of their snowy robes I see,
> But their voices are lost in the dashing tide.
> There's one with ringlets of sunny gold,
> And eyes the reflection of heaven's own blue;
> He crossed in the twilight, dim and cold,
> And the pale mist hid him from mortal view;
> We saw not the angels who met him there—
> The gates of the city we could not see;
> Over the river—over the river
> My father stands waiting, to welcome me.
>
> Over the river the boatman pale
> Carried another—the household pet;
> Her brown curls waved in the gentle gale,
> Darling Rhoda, I see her yet;
> She crossed on her bosom her snowy hands,
> And fearlessly entered the phantom bark;
> We felt it glide from the silver sands,
> And all our sunshine grew strangely dark.
> We know she is safe on the further side
> Where all the ransomed angels be;
> Over the river—the mystic river,
> My childhood's idol, is waiting for me.
>
> For none return from those quiet shores,
> Who cross with the boatman, cold and pale;
> We hear the dip of the golden oars,
> And catch a gleam of the snowy sail;
> And lo! they have passed from our yearning hearts,
> They cross the stream, and are gone for aye;
> We may not sunder the veil apart
> That hides from our vision the gates of day—
> We only know that their barks no more
> May sail with us, o'er life's stormy sea;
> Yet somewhere I know on the unseen shore
> They watch and beckon, and wait for me.
>
> And I sit and think, when the sunset's gold
> Is flushing river, and hill and shore.
> I shall one day stand by the water cold
> And list for the sound of the boatman's oar;
> I shall watch for a gleam of the flapping sail,
> I shall hear the boat as it gains the strand,
> I shall pass from sight with the boatman pale,
> To the better shore of the spirit land.
> I shall know the loved who have gone before,
> And [illegible]
> When over the river, the peaceful river,
> The angel of death shall carry me.

[The [illegible] [illegible] Principia [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Star of the West [illegible] [illegible]]

[illegible] Principia. [illegible] [illegible] at your disposal.
[illegible]
[illegible] A. BUCK

"OVER THE RIVER."

[illegible] Mrs. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> May we [illegible]
> [illegible]
> Over the river!

[illegible] A. B[illegible]

[illegible]

For the Principia.

STORY FOR THE LITTLE FOLKS.

CHAPTER III.

Charley was a bright, g[illegible] little fellow, whose gl[illegible]ful days passed merrily away. And when the evening shades drew on, oh! how his mother pressed him to her heart, and kissed and caressed him with fond maternal love, and sent up her grateful thoughts to God for giving her such a precious boy.

But in process of time the mother was called away for a few hours, and when she returned Charley was not to be found.

As she searched the house she cried "Charley, Charley," but no answer was returned. She examined the premises around the house, and cried again, "Charley, Charley," but he heard her not.

As she sped her way from house to house in search of her boy, and found him not, oh, how her heart beat wildly with emotions, of fear and anguish! And when the evening shades drew on, how intense was her anguish, as she thought that perhaps Charlie was lost in the dark tangled forest, with no bed but the cold damp earth, with no shelter but the heavens o'er him, and that, perhaps, before morning he might be devoured by wild beasts of the wood.

Oh! what a long and tedious night to her stricken heart, and when the morning dawned, how she bounded forth in wild dismay in search of her boy.

Poor stricken mother, thou knowest not the treachery of thy neighbor. Thy boy is in the kidnapper's hands, and is being borne far away toward Southern climes. And as he cries "let me go back to my mother," see that heavy, cruel blow fall upon the quivering frame of the dear little boy, until he suppresses the anguish of his soul and hides it from the kidnapper's view. But oh! the emotions of his soul! who can tell them? as he thinks of his distant home and mother, and reflects "I shall see them no more." And then when the sad realities of slavery are experienced in all their horrors, no wonder if he is driven to desperation. Oh! poor Charlie I lament thy sad state, and would gladly deliver thee, if within my power. And now dear children, don't you pity poor Charlie, and won't you ask God to deliver him from slavery? And yet there are hundreds of little boys and girls stolen from their parents every year, and reduced to slavery. Oh! what a fearfully cruel and wicked thing slavery is! In the language of another let me say—

> Spirit of Cowper! O, [illegible]
> My [illegible] I hate
> 'Tis [illegible]
> That [illegible]
>
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
>
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]

Now, dear children, won't you ask God to break every yoke and let the oppressed go free? And then talk in behalf of [illegible], and when you are old enough [illegible] the privilege [illegible]?

> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]
> [illegible]

Affectionately yours, [illegible] T—

[illegible], January 4th, [illegible]

THE MARVELS OF A SEED.

Have you ever [illegible] how wonderful a thing the seed of a plant is? It is the miracle of miracles. God said, Let there be plants yielding seed; and it is further added, each one "after his kind."

The great naturalist, Cuvier, thought that the germs of all past, present, and future generations of seeds were contained one within the other, as if packed in a succession of boxes. Other learned men have explained this mystery in a different way. But what signify all their explanations? Let them explain it as they will, the wonder remains the same, and we must still look upon the reproduction of the seed as a continual miracle.

Is there upon earth a machine, is there a palace, is there even a city, which contains so much that is wonderful as is inclosed in a single little seed—one grain of corn, one little brown apple-seed, one small seed of a tree, picked up, perhaps, by a sparrow for her little ones, the smallest seed of a poppy or a bluebell, or even one of the seeds that are so small that they float about in the air invisible to our eyes? Ah! there is a world of marvels and brilliant beauties hidden in each of these tiny seeds. Consider their immense number, the perfect separation of the different kinds, their power of life and resurrection, and their wonderful fruitfulness!

Consider first their number. About a hundred and fifty years ago, the celebrated Linnæus, who has been called "the father of botany," reckoned about 8,000 different kinds of plants, and he then thought that the whole number existing could not much exceed 10,000. But, a hundred years after him, M. de Condolle, of Geneva, described 40,000 kinds of plants, and at a later period he counted 60,000, then 80,00, and he supposed it possible that the number might even amount to 100,000.

Well, let me ask you, have these 100,000 kinds of plants ever failed to bear the right seed? Have they ever deceived us? Has a seed of wheat ever yielded barley, or a seed of a poppy grown up into a sunflower? Has a sycamore-tree ever sprung from an acorn, or a beech-tree from a chestnut? A little bird may carry away the small seed of a sycamore in its beak to feed its nestlings, and on the way may drop it on the ground. The tiny seed may spring up and grow where it fell, unnoticed, and sixty years after it may become a magnificent tree, under which the flocks of the valleys and their shepherds may rest in the shade.

Consider next the wonderful power of life and resurrection bestowed on the seeds of plants, so that they may be preserved from year to year, and even from century to century.

Let a child put a few seeds in a drawer and shut them up, and sixty years afterward, when his hair is white and his step tottering, let him take one of these seeds and sow it in the ground, and soon after he will see it spring up into new life, and become a young, fresh, and beautiful plant.

M. Jouannet relates that in the year 1835, several old Celtic tombs were discovered near Bergerac. Under the head of each of the dead bodies there was found a small, square stone or brick, with a hole in it, containing a few seeds, which had been placed there beside the dead by the heathen friends who had buried them, perhaps 1500 or 1700 years before. These seeds were carefully sowed by those who found them, and what do you think was seen to spring up from this dust of the dead?—beautiful sunflowers, blue corn-flowers, and clover, bearing blossoms as bright and sweet as those which are woven into wreaths by the merry children now playing in our fields.

Some years ago a vase, hermetically sealed, was found in a mummy-pit in Egypt, by the English traveler, Wilkinson, who sent it to the British Museum. The librarian there having unfortunately broken it, discovered in it a few grains of wheat and one or two peas, old, wrinkled, and as hard as stone. The peas were planted carefully under glass on the 4th of June, 1844, and at the end of thirty days these old seeds were seen to spring up into new life. They had been buried probably about 3,000 years ago, perhaps in the time of Moses, and had slept all that long time, apparently dead, yet still living in the dust of the tomb.

Is not this a picture of the [illegible] of the resurrection of the dead? Accordingly it is compared by the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv.), where from the springing of the seed he explains the doctrine of the resurrection [illegible].—*Gaussen.*

TELEGRAPHIC DISPATCHES.

Office of the MOUTH at [illegible]
Office of the STOMACH at [illegible]

DISPATCH

INQUIRY.—Mouth to Stomach: Are you ready for breakfast?

STOMACH.—Yes. What are you going to send?

MOUTH.—You will see. Prepare! The table is set. Body hurries—drops into a chair. Mouth opens, and down goes, as quickly as possible, a cup of coffee at a temperature of 145 degrees of Fahrenheit. It burns the whole œsophageal track as it passes it, and when it gets into the Stomach, burns it, and the Stomach contracts and shrivels, and [illegible], and finally screeches—and the

MOUTH says—"Halloo! What is the matter?"

STOMACH.—Matter! Enough I should think. Do you not know that I can not endure Sina at 140 to 160 degrees of heat?"

MOUTH.—"Oh, never mind! Here comes some beef-stake with hot fried potatoes, hot rolls, and poor butter—some salad with vinegar, some buckwheat cakes and mollasses. These will heal it."

STOMACH.—"Stop! What earthly use is there in sending these down here, *all at a time*! They'll make a hodge-podge."

MOUTH.—"Here comes some more coffee!"

STOMACH.—"Hold on! Wait! Give me some *water*!"

MOUTH.—"Water! Water, when you can get coffee? You must be crazy—water has no nourishment in it. One wants water only when one is dry."

STOMACH.—"I am thirsty. Give me some *water!*"

MOUTH.—"Can not do it—they haven't any water up here. If they have, it is hot, and I doubt if they have any of that. Persons do not like water, and you, O stomach, are eccentric; so stop complaining and get ready to take some more food—'take the good the gods provide you' and be content. Are you ready?—I am in a hurry. Up here, time is money. I have to furnish you with material out of which strength is to be gotten for the Body's use to-day, and I have *ten minutes* allowed me for this purpose. Now, the after part is your lookout, not mine. Take notice? Are you ready? Here comes apple-pie, fried chicken, tripe, tomato-catsup, boiled ham, minute pudding, corn bread, and cucumbers, peper, salt, gravy, mince-pie, another cup of coffee—so look out!"

STOMACH.—"Look out! Oh murder! What am I to do? Do! I must grind away at it like a horse in a bark-mill, till I am worn out. Under such a condition of things as this, I shall break down in a fourth part of the time, which I *might* work, but then the mouth—and for that matter, the heart too, will be *still* and I shall be at peace!"—*Prairie Farmer.*

COPYING A BLOT.

"Mother, which of all the big boys should you like for me to pattern?" asked a little boy who was looking round for a good example.

"Which would you think?" asked his mother, "you know the big boys better than I do."

The little boy thought. "There's [illegible] Dan Parker, he smokes; there's Bill Parker he swears; Tom Jones, he's got a horrid temper. Sam Jay, he sprees it; Jim Wood, he hates study. Joe Blake, he's cross; Charlie Doe he goes fishing on Sunday; Gus Tyng he tells whoppers. Mother, there isn't one [illegible], if I copy, I [illegible] copy a blot from."

"Oh! how the ugly [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] out." "Well, [illegible], there is one perfect pattern." "Who?" asked the boy eagerly. "I should love to know him." "The Son of [illegible]," answered she, "who did no sin neither was guile found in his mouth, and who left us an example that we should follow his steps." [illegible] children! God knew you would need a perfect pattern to copy from! You would not copy God, because he is a Spirit; therefore he sent [illegible] pattern in a [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] a child, to grow [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. He has [illegible] [illegible] to copy. [illegible]

DRYING VEGETABLES.

It is an art that ought to be [illegible] by every [illegible] or owner of a garden—that of [illegible] [illegible] winter use or a winter market. The editor of the [illegible] *Cottage Gardener* says he [illegible] received from Holland few packages of Sugar Peas, Kidney Beans and [illegible] tatoes in a dried state, which, when cooked, [illegible] flavored as they would have been in a green state. They were obtained by drying in chambers through which currents of heated air were conducted; they were [illegible] shriveled up and had the appearance of strips of parchment or leather, until they were boiled, and then swelled out to their usual dimensions. He has [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] preserved by [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] afterwards drying [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] may be kept any length of time if kept [illegible] for use.

CLEAN HANDS AND STRENGTH.—A little boy [illegible] name I shall call John, was observed to wash his hands many times a day—a most praiseworthy [illegible] unusual frequency with which he repaired to the [illegible] stone by the well, led his elder brother Henry to ask why he washed his hands so frequently.

"Because I wish to be strong."

"Do you think that washing your hands will make [illegible] strong?"

"Yes."

"I hope you will hold on to that idea."

At evening, as the two brothers were sitting on the [illegible] of the farm house, listening to the notes of the whippoorwill, Henry asked John why he thought that washing his hands would give him strength.

"Because I read it in the Bible," was the reply.

"Where did you find the passage?"

"I will show you."

He got the Bible, and read the latter part of the ninth verse of the seventeenth chapter of Job, "He that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger."—John [illegible] sure his position was a firm one, for it had the support of Scripture. Henry proceeded to explain to him the meaning of the passage, and convinced him that he had taken in a literal sense that which was intended to be understood in a figurative sense—that the passage taught that those who do right shall increase in strength to do right. The truth thus explained made a deep impression upon John's [illegible] and I wish it may make a deep impression upon the mind of the reader. Boys love to be strong. The highest kind of strength is strength to do right.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia* [illegible]
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols. $1 [illegible]
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 vol. $1 00 [illegible]
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 vol., $0 50 [illegible]

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.
FOR THE MILLION.
I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.
[illegible]
[illegible]

N. B. [illegible]

Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery.
[illegible]
[illegible] those advertised [illegible] orders for any [illegible]